



**A Documentary Filmstrip
analyzing
Abortion on Demand
And Population Control**

LICENSE TO KILL
The Drive to Promote
Abortion on Demand

...is a documentary filmstrip about the plans and programs to institute "population control" in this country — including abortion on demand for the parents of millions of unborn children.

Urge your friends to see this film and to become better informed about this crucial struggle. For only then will this war on life be stopped.

Produced by

MOTOREDE

The Movement To Restore Decency

©1971

The Movement To Restore Decency

License To Kill

This filmstrip deals with a serious question. We ask that parents take into consideration that it is not intended for children.

If the material in this filmstrip upsets you, we suggest that your objections be directed to those who are responsible for promoting abortion on demand. Although we are dealing with a very delicate subject, we have attempted to do so in the most dignified manner possible, for we know no other way to show the horror and terror that is being planned for millions of parents and their unborn children.

One of the most controversial issues in our country today is that of "abortion on demand." It is being discussed and debated in our State Legislatures, in Congress, in our churches, and in the communications media.

Let us say at the outset of this presentation that family planning and therapeutic abortion will not be considered here. The morality and desirability of these matters, as well as the question of sacrificing the life of an unborn child to save that of the mother, are a matter of personal faith and conscience beyond the scope of this discussion.

The proponents of legalized abortion are not particularly concerned with the justification of therapeutic abortion, either. Their main argument is that a woman has the right to have an abortion for *any* reason. The proponents of legalized abortion attempt to justify their position with the following arguments.

First, it is a woman's civil right to do what she wants with her own body. This sounds reasonable, if you ignore the fact that medical science has proven conclusively that the unborn child is a separate, living entity from the moment of conception. But, leaving aside this consideration for a moment, if this argument is correct does it not follow that other laws restricting the "civil right to control one's body" should also be repealed — such as laws against prostitution, drug abuse, indecent exposure, and compulsory health measures? Is it possible that the pro-abortionists would repeal these laws as well?

Another argument advanced by the proponents of legalized abortion is that parents should only be expected to raise *wanted* children. Unwanted off-spring, they contend, should be killed before they are born. But those thousands of families who have raised happy, loving, and successful *adopted* children would certainly dispute this claim. And on the subject of “unwanted children,” from a medical standpoint, Dr. Eugene F. Diamond of the Stritch School of Medicine points out:

Much is made of the appeal to prevent the birth of unwanted children. It seems to me that there is a confusion involved here which results from the failure to distinguish between the unwanted child and the unwanted pregnancy.

In fifteen years of experience with the parent-child relationship, I have rarely encountered a mother who asked to be rid of her child once she had taken it home from the nursery.

Dr. Diamond also states that seventy-five percent of the mothers who have been refused legal abortions in Sweden not only went on to have their babies and were happy with them, but that most of these mothers actually had an improvement in their mental attitudes and adjustment.

The concern of the pro-abortionists over the “mental health” of unhappy expectant mothers contradicts the experience of another country as well. In Japan, which has had abortion on demand for nearly twenty years, the leading newspaper there recently stated that Japanese women have suffered severely, both psychologically and physically, as a result. *Asahi Shimbun*, which has a circulation of over five million, said emphatically that the nearly one million abortions being performed each year in Japan are doing untold *permanent* harm to the women of that country. And many doctors in the United States, including pro-abortionist Laurence Lader, confirm that having a child murdered in the womb can cause a mother intense mental anguish lasting perhaps a lifetime. Dr. Lader also points out, “Even more disturbing was the fact that many women became pregnant again within six months.”

The problems caused by unlimited abortions on demand are by no means limited to Japan. They are becoming common in every country with legalized abortion. For example, such abortions have increased so greatly in socialized England — some 840% in just two years — that hospitals are over-crowded and women needing essential gynecological care are unable to obtain it.

Another claim raised by the abortionists to rationalize their position is, “The fetus is only a part of the mother’s body.” Logically extending this reasoning, a fetus is no more separate than, for example, a fingernail which can be cut off and discarded for any reason. Most people, happily, realize that a human embryo is in a much higher category than a fingernail. As Dr. Diamond has stated:

To consider the fetus not to be a separate person but merely a

part of the mother has not been tenable since the sixteenth century, when Arantius showed the maternal and fetal circulations were separate – neither continuous nor contiguous.

Dr. Charles E. Rice, Professor of Law at Notre Dame University, and author of *The Vanishing Right to Live*, has stated this truth even more vividly:

The unborn child is in fact a human being from the moment of conception. When the child in the womb weighs only one-thirtieth of an ounce, he has every internal organ he will ever have as an adult. On the eighteenth day after his conception, his heart starts beating. At eighteen weeks, he can suck his thumb, scratch himself and even cry.

Yes, an unborn child is a living, separate person. Mothers instinctively realize this, even before the child they are carrying makes his presence – and his aliveness – obvious. But incredibly, some abortionists even bring up the allegation that the embryo is not alive. Dr. Diamond replies:

It is certainly alive, since it possesses that hallmark of life – the ability to reproduce dying cells. It can be distinguished from any other non-human species. Once implanted, it requires only time and nutrition. Only two possible futures are open to it: It can become a live human being – or a dead human fetus.

Many of the pro-abortionists also like to claim that “legalizing abortion will put the criminal abortionists out of business.” This implies that giving an abortionist a government license somehow makes it right. Wise men throughout history have known that there can be – and often is – a huge difference between what is legal and what is *right*. But even the pro-abortionists’ claim is refuted by the facts. In Denmark, for example, which has had liberalized abortion for many years, health officials estimate that there are now two illegal abortions for every one that has received government approval.

The final and most popular argument of the abortion lobby is that concern for the “quality of life” *demands* legalizing abortion. Only healthy, wanted children should be born today – especially with the problem of population explosion facing us. For example, if a human embryo is known to have a birth defect, such as a deformed arm, it would be more humane to abort it – which is simply a nice sounding euphemism for throwing it away in a hospital bucket.

Unbelievably, these pro-abortionists say that killing the unborn child with a birth defect is more humane than rehabilitating him, so he can live a satisfying and productive life. If this argument has merit, why limit such “humane death” to the unborn? Why not kill such below average persons now?

If this sounds too far-fetched, you will be interested to learn that Dr. Francis Crick, a British Nobel Prize winner, has suggested that a child not be declared

legally alive until forty-eight hours after birth. This would give the experts time to give the child an "acceptance test." If he or she is below standard, Dr. Crick proposes doing away with him. Such children, these experts declare, are below their standards for "quality of life." In later years, they may have trouble adjusting to a society of normal people. So why not dispose of them now — mercifully, of course, for their own good and the good of society — a "quality of life" society.

These proposals have been heard before. More than thirty years ago, the citizens of another country elected a leader who promised a "quality of life" society. He believed that only "acceptable" children should be allowed to become part of society; those who were considered defective were to be used for so-called scientific experiments or otherwise purged. Not having the assistance of the Madison Avenue sloganeers, he did not use the expression, "quality of life." He called it the "master race." His phrase was not as dignified, but it was certainly more to the point. And unfortunately, as history has recorded, millions of persons came to accept Adolph Hitler's proposals for his "quality of life" society.

Does this tragedy of three decades ago have special significance for us today? We believe it does. As Dr. Rice has stated:

If an innocent human being can be killed because he is too young, that is, he has not lived nine months from his conception, there is no reason in principle why he cannot be killed because he is too old; or too retarded; or too black; or too politically undesirable. The philosophy is Nazi Germany's. And this nation is adopting it.

This is the kind of power that the pro-abortionists want to place in the hands of government officials who would control their "quality of life" society.

Many Americans have accepted the smooth-sounding arguments of the pro-abortionists simply because they do not realize what abortion is. To understand the true nature of the issue upon which our courts and our legislators are being asked to decide, let us examine more closely what is being proposed.

A few months after abortion on demand was legalized in the State of New York, the *Medical Tribune* published an article on "Great Care Urged in Choosing Method for Inducing Abortion." The article revealed that, at the Albany Medical Center alone, one hundred abortions had been performed from July to September, 1970. "Of the one hundred abortions, sixty-three were done by a combination of vacuum and sharp curettage, twenty-one were by saline injection, and fifteen were by hysterotomy." These are the three main types of abortive procedures. Let's examine them one at a time.

The vacuum and sharp curettage method is a refinement of an older procedure called "dilation and curettage," or simply "D & C." This method is usually employed during the first twelve weeks of pregnancy.

Here is an eleven-week-old embryo. All that it needs is time and nutrition. But if the pro-abortionists are successful, this unborn child may get something altogether different. After expanding the cervical opening with dilators, the physician wrests the embryo from the uterine lining with an ovum forceps. The surgical procedure then continues with the use of a curette, literally scraping out the remaining placental tissue. Gauze sponging is used to remove the last vestiges of both, and the operation is complete. What was once a living human embryo in the mother's uterus, needing only time and nutrition, has now been reduced to this.

New developments in medical equipment and procedures have made possible the employment of a vibrator which dilates the cervix more quickly and efficiently. Then, by employing a vacuum pump arrangement attached to a suction tube, the physician literally sucks out the embryonic contents of the uterus and discards them. *This* is what is being sucked from the uterus and thrown away.

Another abortive technique is described in an article in the *Danish Medical Bulletin* of August, 1962, entitled "Introduction of Abortion by Intraovular Instillation of Hypertonic Saline." This procedure is employed during the second three months of pregnancy. First, a certain amount of the fluid surrounding the fetus is extracted. Then it is replaced with an equivalent amount of saline solution. In less than three hours, the living embryo is dead. Within approximately thirty-six hours, labor begins and finally the abortion is complete.

The third common abortive procedure is called a hysterotomy. It is usually employed after the first trimester of pregnancy. As in a cesarean birth, the mother's womb is opened surgically and the living fetus is removed, allowed to die, and discarded.

As you can see from this *Los Angeles Times* article of December 19, 1970, twenty-six fetuses have been aborted *alive* in New York City alone. One of those fetuses, a girl, has survived and at the time of the article she was four months old. The other twenty-five who could not survive "showed signs of life" as we define it — heartbeats, gasps, and muscular movements.

And incredibly, the pro-abortionists want to give dignity to the word "abortion." Even more incredibly, powerful voices are heard in our press and our pulpits, from our campuses and our courts, and even in our legislative halls, suggesting that this mass murder of human embryos is a *right* — a right to kill! And we are talking about *mass* murder — the deliberate death of hundreds of thousands — in fact, millions — of unborn infants.

In the July 1970 issue of *OB-GYN Observer*, Dr. Margolis, Associate Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology at the University of California San Francisco Medical Center, revealed that under the liberalized abortion law in California, "About twenty percent of the women who conceive request abortion." Bearing

this figure in mind, if abortion is legalized throughout this country, we would be talking about murdering some one million living fetuses per year. Extending this figure to encompass the world conception rate, we would be talking about an annual murder rate of some ten million living fetuses. Legalized abortion is truly a license to kill.

But, is legalized abortion the ultimate goal of its promoters? Or is it just an intermediate step in reaching an even larger objective? For an answer to these questions, let's look for a moment at some of the groups promoting "abortion on demand."

One of the most active organizations agitating for easy abortions, at least on the street level, is the Women's Liberation Movement, or Women's Lib. Its members use parades, picketing, street demonstrations, and other tactics to secure maximum publicity for their demands. Much has been written about this movement, and almost all sources agree that it is "revolutionary" to say the least.

Many of their ideological stands range from the immoral to the amoral. But what is most revealing is indicated in this article, "Capitalism is the Enemy." Their stand is virtually in complete agreement with that of Lenin, when he legalized abortion in 1920 in Russia. In fact, Lenin used a claim we often hear today: "It is a woman's civil right to do as she wants with her own body." The Communist ruler of Russia realized that destroying traditional family life was an essential step toward dictatorship. And promoting "abortion on demand" was one technique Lenin used to destroy the sanctity of the family. Is this only the beginning? What might be the ultimate goal of the social planners who advocate legalized abortion? Let's look at this article from the *Chicago Tribune* of March 23, 1970. The final goal of the planners is revealed as follows:

Congressman John Kleine said the legislator's efforts will be further aided by the growing awareness of air and water pollution, urban congestion and other evils resulting from overpopulation.

"Those who fear our environment will soon become uninhabitable can look to one basic cause for the entire problem," he said. "There are too many people in the world. Abortion and birth control will be important factors in solving the problem."

Obviously the abortion issue is merely an intermediate step. The ultimate goal of the social planners, or *Insiders*, can be summed up in one word: *Control!* Control of only two things: Environment and population.

Let's analyze this carefully, because the point to be made is most important. If you control environment and population, do you not in fact control the world? Stated broadly, what else is there in the world except environment and people? The proponents of environmental and population control are, in reality, talking about control of the world. But how?

For the sake of convenience we shall call the master planners — the persons who are organizing and directing these campaigns — the *Insiders*. Surely a relative handful of people could not begin to contemplate control of this magnitude unless there were an agency by which and through which they could achieve this control.

There is such an agency. It's called government. And, to control the total environment and population, a government must be very large indeed. It must be large enough, in fact, to be able to suppress any resistance to that control. A government of this size has a name. It's called a totalitarian dictatorship, which is nothing more than a police state. Regardless of the name you may wish to give it — socialism, communism, fascism, or welfare statism — they all are, or will ultimately lead to, a police state. The aim of the *Insiders* is to increase the size, reach, and influence of government; and especially to increase the effectiveness of the skeletal structure for world government, the United Nations, including many of its related agencies.

One contrived excuse being used to justify their expansion of governmental power is *overpopulation*. They claim that there are too many people on the earth, and that if the population growth continues to rise, the planet will soon be overcrowded. We do not have time now to expose *all* of the fallacies and half-truths that the *Insiders* are using to promote total government controls in the United States. However, let us consider for a moment one part of the drive to justify abortion and other “people control” measures — the overpopulation crisis.

It is true that the population of the world is growing — faster in some areas than in others. But it is also true that, as a general rule, population is increasing most rapidly in the underpopulated areas, notably Latin America and Africa. Brazil, for instance — often cited by the population controllers as a “horrible example” of overpopulation — is a nation with almost exactly the same land area as the United States and a very similar potential for economic development. Yet it has less than half our present population. By any reasonable standard, Brazil is *underpopulated* and needs *more* people to ensure its effective development.

One nation where the population is increasing despite present, serious problems is India — and naturally it is cited again and again by the population controllers. But even there the population density is only one-half that of the Netherlands, which maintains a very high standard of living indeed. The human misery characteristic of living conditions in India obviously does not result from its large population but from other factors, ranging from poor economic development to ignorance, destructive mores, and the radical socialism of its government.

Responsible authorities such as Dr. Donald Bogue, University of Chicago; Professor Ansley Coale of Princeton, and Professor Karl Brandt of Stanford

University have repeatedly stated that the population explosion is a hoax. They point out that the American people actually live on only one percent of the land in this country and that if the entire population of the Earth were placed within the United States of America, each group of six people would have four acres available to them. They could live on the land and raise their own food if necessary. This would leave the remainder of the land mass of the entire world available for additional food production and population expansion in the future. In fact, at the April 1970 meeting of the Population Association of America, the demographers stated that the "population explosion" has been turned into a propaganda myth.

But facts have never deterred the master planners who seek control of this country. Those facts they cannot distort they simply ignore. Their premise is false and their solution is terrifying.

Just in case you think this is exaggerated, read an editorial from the September 1970 *California Medical Association Official Journal*. The editorial says:

The traditional Judeo-Christian belief that places great emphasis on the worth and equal value of every human life may have to be altered. It will become necessary and acceptable to place relative rather than absolute values on such things as human lives, the use of scarce resources and the various elements which are to make up the quality of life or living.

Stated broadly, the pro-abortionists offer two basic solutions: (1) Decrease the birth rate; and (2) Increase the death rate. This may sound very logical, if you accept the false premise of overpopulation.

The major proposal to decrease the birth rate is by birth control and sterilization, preferably voluntary but mandatory if necessary. The details of this proposal were formulated a few years ago. To illustrate, a bill was actually proposed before the State Legislature of Hawaii which would compel the mandatory sterilization of all women after they have had their second child. The bill, fortunately, was rejected this time; but it is incredible that a bill of this type could even be proposed to a state legislature for consideration.

The major proposal to increase the death rate is euthanasia or "mercy killing." For those who still feel it can't happen here, may we remind you that official, government testimony revealed that a bill was proposed in the State of Florida legalizing the killing of old people.

A few years ago, it was revealed that, under socialized medicine in England, some hospital patients who had reached the age of sixty-five or over were simply being refused further medical treatment and allowed to die. And what is even more incredible, there is now talk in the United States about legalizing euthanasia for young children born with birth defects if, in the opinion of the board of experts, the child would have difficulty in adjusting to society. And by

and large, the majority of people who support these programs are against capital punishment and against war, because, in their view, killing is inhumane.

Birth control and sterilization, the main methods of decreasing the birth rate, combined with euthanasia or “mercy killing” of young and old, the main method of increasing the death rate, are the proposed humane solutions to the myth of overpopulation. But what about abortion? According to the social planners, this is the most humane solution of all; for, in one single operation you can in effect increase the death rate while decreasing the birth rate.

“Quality of life” is an integral part of the *Insiders’* program for expanding governmental reach and power to international proportions. The World Health Organization is an agency of the United Nations, and it is prepared to administer the total program of world-wide population control. They publish *World Health Magazine* and, in addition, they publish a technical report series. The conclusions of many of these reports are eventually implemented into official programs.

The Report No. 416 on Genetic Counseling may give a general idea of things to come in the area of “quality of life.” On page ten, they describe the techniques of taking amniotic cell cultures from pregnant women to detect chromosomal aberrations at an early stage of intrauterine life. Ostensibly, if it is thought that the child would not have the proper characteristics to fit into society, it could be aborted in its early stages of development.

On page twenty, they describe the strong advisability of professional genetic counselling when choosing a mate. In other words, to insure that their children will not have physical traits contrary to the good of society, potential marriage partners should have their chromosomes checked for desirability levels before marriage.

Yes, the abortion issue is only a part of something much larger. To understand fully the total implications involved, let’s examine the moral philosophies of some of the proponents. Dr. Ashley Montague is an advocate of legalized abortion, and of “planned parenthood.” This article from the *Chicago Tribune* of January 23, 1970, gives some idea of *his* moral philosophy:

We should grant no one a marriage license; at best, couples should get a learner’s permit. Then, if they prove they can carry that relationship, they may marry. But they can’t have children yet. They would have to take another exam to see if they can discharge their responsibilities to raise humans rather than people. (A human is one who regards living and loving as one.)

He also defined abortion as “a humane act to enable a woman to determine if she wants to go on with a pregnancy. All abortions should be legalized and permitted with the consent of three members of the medical profession for no other reason than that the mother desires one.” Yet, several years ago in his

book, *Life Before Birth*, Dr. Montague said that the embryo was a “living, striving human being from the very beginning.” By his own definition, he believes in a license to kill.

In 1964 this book, *Too Many Americans*, was published. Its premise was that the alleged population explosion in this country was more of a threat to the world than even the alleged world population explosion. Remembering that this book was written several years ago, let's examine the authors' recommendations:

In short what we must have – and what our recommendations have been aimed at – is a society in which: (1) no unwanted child is born; (2) the decision to bear or not to bear a child is made solely by the potential parents; and (3) most important of all for the goal of a stable population, this decision is made in a social and cultural context in which a family of three children is considered large.

After issuing a warning that we must follow their recommendations voluntarily, or else, for the good of the world, big government will force us to implement them, the authors then state:

Discussing some of the less coercive possibilities, Professor Richard L. Meier of the University of Michigan suggests that although parenthood could be monopolized by a select few, it might not be necessary to sterilize the remainder of the population – if they can be induced to remain childless in response to an environmental context that discourages family building.

Meier also cites several possibilities for the development of new kinds of relationships that would restrict parenthood while presenting alternatives to our system of monogamous marriage: acceptance and encouragement of the institution of companionate marriage, including its legal recognition as a kind of limited liability partnership to which certain tax and inheritance advantages would accrue. This would be tantamount to recognizing two forms of marriage, at least one of which would anticipate no children.

An important question to answer concerning the population control issue is *who* is supposedly doing the overpopulating? Many people would suggest India, for example, or the poor uneducated families in our own congested cities. But, Dr. Paul Ehrlich of Stanford University and author of *The Population Bomb*, suggests an entirely different group: The American middle class! The American middle class – the mighty backbone of this nation – obviously poses the greatest threat to the *Insiders'* goals. How does Dr. Ehrlich propose dealing with them? Here are his proposals.

First, establish commissions and bureaus, with massive budgets for propaganda, to convince people that a problem exists. Next, eliminate any tax deductions for children; instead increase the tax burden. Void all laws prohibiting abortions. Then make instruction in birth control mandatory

in all schools. And if these steps fail to solve the problem, Dr. Ehrlich says, government should make birth control compulsory.

Control of the middle class — that mighty backbone of the greatest country on earth. If they could be controlled and eventually eliminated, there would be no obstacle in the path of the *Insiders* on their way to totalitarian rule on a world-wide scale.

Yes, by creating the population control issue, and with the ever-available assistance of the mass communications media, the *Insiders* have engineered a vast program the magnitude of which is so great that financing on a grand scale is required. The *Congressional Record* of December 29, 1969, reveals that the bulk of the financing comes from the tax-exempt Ford Foundation and Rockefeller Foundation.

Time does not permit the detailed analysis of how so many tax-exempt foundations have been used by and for the *Insiders* to create and promote socialistic and left-leaning programs in both domestic and foreign policies. Factual material has been made available on this subject proving beyond any doubt the validity of this point. And in the population control program, the financing for its many component parts comes mainly from the Ford Foundation, of which Henry Ford II is the dominant trustee, and the Rockefeller Foundation, of which John D. Rockefeller III is chairman.

And, here in the United States, the population control programs are faring very well indeed. Those on the inside are obviously happy. The *Insiders*, who are financing the horror, are even appointed to presidential commissions to advise the President. The programs seem to be coming along as if they were planned that way.

Shown here is a close up of Senate Bill No. 3746, the Packwood Bill, to legalize abortions in the entire United States. It authorizes a licensed physician in any state to perform an abortion on any female person who requests it. Note the increase of the size, reach, and power of the Federal government implicit in Section 4 of the bill: "The laws of any State or political subdivision thereof inconsistent with any provision of this Act are to the extent of that inconsistency hereby superseded."

As if this isn't enough, a revised form of Senate Bill No. 2108 was approved late in 1970 creating a Federal Office of Population Control and establishing a budget of nearly four-hundred million dollars, which obviously will support the size, reach, power, and control of the Federal government in almost any area of population control. Quietly this bill passed during a "lame duck" session of Congress, and you can be sure those on the "inside" knew exactly what was happening.

When legislatures are too slow to act, you may be certain that the *Insiders*

will find some way to increase the pace. For example, early in 1970 President Nixon authorized "abortion on demand" in every American military hospital — regardless of the laws of the states in which they are located. It has the force of law — although Congress was not even consulted on the matter — and places no restrictions whatever on the age of the aborted fetuses.*

The question now is: Can all these things be coincidental? Is it just coincidence that our once fine, moral standards have been degraded until so many of our citizens have now been reduced to the lowest level of morality? Is it just a coincidence that the Supreme Court legalized pornography, thus further opening the doors to amorality and immorality? Is it just a coincidence that the Presidential Commission on Pornography ruled pornography really harmless, thus contributing further to the moral degeneration? Is it just a coincidence that our youth are deliberately given easier access to drugs which will destroy them both morally and physically?

Is it just a coincidence that organized drives to institute sex education in the schools, from kindergarten through high school, have taken place simultaneously throughout all sections of the country? The leading organization behind this drive is SIECUS, Sex Information and Education Council of the United States, directed by Dr. Mary Calderone. Is it just a coincidence that in 1955 Dr. Calderone was active in planned parenthood and edited the book, *Abortion In The United States* (incidentally with an introduction by Dr. Ashley Montague), favorable to abortion? Dr. Calderone shows her great love for children when she says, "We are still unable to put babies in the class of dangerous epidemics even though this is the exact truth."

Are all of these things just coincidental? Abortion, pornography, sexual promiscuity, drugs, sex education in the schools, and many other programs — are they just isolated having no connection with one another — or are they in fact parts of the same general plan which fit together perfectly?

This is exactly the point. It is *not* coincidental. Obviously, we are faced with a conspiracy of world-wide proportions. There is only one thing a conspiracy fears and that is the same thing a burglary ring in a parking lot fears — the lights of truthful exposure on their activities, background, methods, and purposes. With the lights turned on, the conspiracy cannot operate.

To combat this amoral conspiracy, we have a nationwide network of groups all working as one. We recommend your consideration of MOTOREDE Committees, the Movement to Restore Decency, which will write letters,

* Shortly after this filmstrip was produced, the pressure of public opinion forced a reversal of this policy. President Nixon announced on April 3, 1971 that military hospitals must obey the abortion laws of the State in which they are located. However, the Administration continues to promote "population control" programs, and massive Federal funding continues to underwrite them.

distribute literature, and show films such as this one exposing these evil forces, and will continue to restore those traditional moral values that this great country once possessed. But time is growing short. We are even now very close to the point of no return.

If the silent majority is not willing to become involved, like the silent majorities in other countries taken over by totalitarian dictatorships, they will be forever silent. This is not alarmism or sensationalism; it is a plain statement of historical fact. After all, it only stands to reason: if you have a license to kill at one end of the spectrum of life then that license is valid for any portion of that spectrum. If this happens, we'll have only ourselves to blame — no one else.

Is it really too much to ask you to defend the right to life of millions of innocent, living human beings? Our responsibilities — and our peril — were clearly defined nearly two thousand years ago, when the Master Teacher told us: "Whatsoever you have done to the least of these, my brethren, you have done it unto Me."

This pamphlet is the text of the 35-mm. color filmstrip, "License To Kill," produced by the Movement To Restore Decency. Additional copies of this pamphlet are available at the following prices: One to 99 copies, seven for one dollar; 100-999 copies, twelve cents each; 1000 or more copies, ten cents each. The filmstrip itself is thirty dollars, with soundtrack on either 7½ ips tape recording or 33 1/3 record. (\$35.00 with soundtrack on both tape and record.)

The Movement To Restore Decency, or MOTOREDE, is a nationwide network of local committees that are working to restore those traditional values, standards, and morals that have always characterized this nation. The MOTOREDE program is sponsored by The John Birch Society, and is open to all Americans who are concerned about the problems of indecency and degradation in this country.

To order copies of the pamphlet or filmstrip, or for more information about MOTOREDE, please address:

THE MOVEMENT TO RESTORE DECENCY

4 Hill Road
Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

2627 Mission Street
San Marino, California 91108

Also Available From

The Movement To Restore Decency

THE MOTOREDE PACKET — Eleven articles and reprints on the threats young Americans face, and how the tide of degeneracy flooding this nation can be reversed. Subjects discussed include sex education, sensitivity training, pornography, and narcotics. (One dollar each.)

THE DRUG PACKET — The definitive analysis of the drug problem in the United States. Includes articles by Dr. Hardin B. Jones, Dr. John DeTar, and the Los Angeles Police Department. Explains how narcotics are pushed, the effects of escalating drug use in this country, and how this problem can be solved. (One dollar each.)

THE INNOCENTS DEFILED — A documentary filmstrip on sex education in the schools. Exposes the plans of SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the United States) and other sexologists to establish continuous and compulsory “sex education” courses from kindergarten through twelfth grade — at the expense of morality and parental authority. (Thirty dollars with soundtrack on tape or record.)

LICENSE TO KILL — A filmstrip discussing the controversy over “abortion on demand” — and the drive by revolutionary social planners in this country to promote “population control” measures that will lead to a police state tyranny. (Thirty dollars with sound track on tape or record.)

All materials shipped prepaid when payment accompanies orders.
Order from:

THE MOVEMENT TO RESTORE DECENCY

4 Hill Road
Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

2627 Mission Street
San Marino, California 91108